

A Jdent 4/7/70 - SJ

Document No. 193
Adopted at Meeting of 6/27/62

Resolution re Determinations and Findings
Washington Park

*superseded
by Doc 242*

WHEREAS, the Boston Redevelopment Authority, hereinafter called the "Authority", is a public body, politic and corporate, duly organized and existing under the provisions of the Housing Authority Law of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and having a usual place of business in the City of Boston, Massachusetts; and

WHEREAS, the Authority has, with the approval of the Mayor and City Council of the City of Boston and with financial assistance provided under Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, by the Housing and Home Finance Agency of the United States of America undertaken and conducted surveys, studies and inspections of an area in the City of Boston, known and referred to as the Washington Park Urban Renewal Area hereinafter called the "Project Area", for which area the Authority is preparing an urban renewal plan, and in which the Authority proposes to undertake an urban renewal project, said area being more particularly described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and made a part of this resolution as if fully set forth herewith; and

WHEREAS, the Authority has, after due and proper notice, held a public hearing with respect to the Project Area and, at said hearing, received and heard extensive evidence, facts, data, statements, exhibits, views, and opinions with respect to said Project Area and its conditions, including (a) statements, facts, data, and statistics presented by officials of the City of Boston respecting building, fire, health, police, public works, and traffic control problems in the Project Area

and their causes, and law enforcement problems in the Project Area and their causes, (b) statements, survey facts, study reports and extensive exhibits prepared and presented by members of the Authority's staff, including detailed explanations of the survey and study procedures used by the staff, detailed descriptions of the Project Area, the present character, physical conditions, and uses of land and structures therein, historical data respecting the economic and land use trends therein, inspection reports respecting the physical condition of every structure in the Project Area, and an extensive collection of interior and exterior photographs disclosing the appearance and physical condition of structures throughout the Project Area and in every section thereof, and (c) statements, opinions, views and data from various interested individuals, and representatives of various organizations pertaining to the conditions existing in the Project Area; and

WHEREAS, the Authority has at said public hearing also received and heard evidence as to certain proposed clearance section tracts of the Washington Park Urban Renewal Area, and more particularly described in Exhibit "B" attached hereto and made a part of this resolution as if fully set forth herewith, including evidence as to the condition of

each of the described tracts, facts, data, statements, exhibits, views and opinions, from members of the Authority's staff and from various interested individuals as to the advisability of acquiring, relocating the occupants of, demolishing, clearing and disposing of land within the said clearance section tracts in advance of the adoption and approval of an urban renewal plan for the area;

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Boston Redevelopment Authority acting under and pursuant to its power under the provisions of said Housing Authority Law and any other powers thereunto enabling, does hereby determine, declare and find (1) that the Project Area is a substandard and decadent area in that it is an area wherein dwellings predominate which by reason of dilapidation, overcrowding, faulty arrangement or design, lack of ventilation, light or sanitation facilities, and combinations of these factors, are detrimental to safety, health, morals, welfare and sound growth of the Boston community, and that it is an area which is detrimental to safety, health, morals, welfare and the sound growth of the Boston community because of the existence of buildings which are out of repair, physically deteriorated, unfit for human habitation, obsolete and in need of major maintenance and repair, and because buildings have been torn down and not replaced and in which under existing conditions it is improbable that the buildings will be replaced, and

because of a substantial change in business and economic conditions, and because of inadequate light, air and open space, and because of excessive land coverage, and because diversity of ownership, irregular lot sizes and obsolete street patterns make it improbable that the area will be redeveloped by the ordinary operations of private enterprise, and (2) that each of the certain clearance section tracts situated within the project area and hereinbefore described is a substandard and decadent area in that it is an area wherein dwellings predominate which by reason of dilapidation, overcrowding, faulty arrangement of design, lack of ventilation, light or sanitation facilities and combinations of these factors, are detrimental to safety, health, morals, welfare and sound growth of the Boston community, because of the existence of buildings which are out of repair, physically deteriorated, unfit for human habitation, obsolete or in need of major maintenance and repair, and because buildings have been torn down and not replaced and in which under existing conditions it is improbable that the buildings will be replaced, and because of a substantial change in business and economic conditions, and because of inadequate light, air and open space, and because of excessive land coverage, and because diversity of ownership, irregular lot sizes and obsolete street patterns make it improbable that each such tract

will be redeveloped by the ordinary operation of private enterprise.

Be it further resolved that the Boston Redevelopment Authority does hereby determine, declare and find the following particular facts to be true and correct:

The results of all surveys and studies, with respect to the present character and condition of the Washington Park Urban Renewal Area as a whole, can be set forth as follows:

1. Approximately 344.7 acres of land within the area were found to be improved with buildings or other structures, and approximately 100.0 acres were found to be devoted to improved streets. Together such improved land was found to represent approximately 94.1 percent of the total of about 472.3 acres of land lying within the perimeter boundaries of the urban renewal area. Land improved with buildings, streets, or other improvements was found to be distributed generally throughout the entire area.
2. Approximately 338.8 acres of land within the area were found to be devoted to uses which were residential in character, exclusive of streets, alleys, and other public rights-of-way. Such land was found to represent approximately 91.4 percent of the total net land area of about 370.6 acres lying within the perimeter

boundaries of the urban renewal area. Blocks clearly predominantly residential in character were found to be distributed generally throughout the entire area.

3. Approximately 31.8 acres of land within the area were found to be devoted to uses which were non-residential in character, including businesses, industries, and institutions. Such land was found to represent approximately 8.6 percent of the total net land area within the area. Blocks characterized by non-residential uses were found to be distributed generally throughout many sections of the entire area. Within these blocks non-residential uses were found to be intermingled with and adjoining uses which were residential in character.
4. Approximately 2,814 buildings, or 99.4 percent of the total number of 2,834 principal buildings within the area, were found to be non-fireproof or of frame construction.
5. Approximately 177 buildings, or 6.2 percent of the total number of 2,834 principal buildings within the area, were found to be devoted to uses which were non-residential in character, including businesses, industries, and institutions. Such buildings were found to be distributed generally throughout many sections of the entire area, intermingled with and adjoining buildings devoted to uses which were residential in character.
6. Approximately 1,520 buildings, or 53.6 percent of the 2,834 principal buildings within the area were found, based on all surveys and inspections, to be buildings with either extensive minor, or major defects, and/or serious deficiencies.
7. Approximately 692 buildings, or 24.4 percent of the 2,834 principal buildings within the area were found, based on all surveys and inspections, to be buildings with such major defects and/or serious deficiencies as to be beyond repair to a point warranting clearance.
8. The detailed interior and exterior inspections of the principal buildings throughout the urban renewal area as a whole, disclosed that:
 - (a) 902, or 79.4 percent, were found to have one or more defects.
 - (b) 490, or 43.1 percent, were found to have five or more defects.
 - (c) 293, or 25.8 percent, were found to have 10 or more defects.

- (d) 83, or 7.3 percent, were found to have 15 or more defects.
 - (e) 170, or 15.0 percent were found to have foundation walls which were deteriorated, sinking, and/or out of line.
 - (f) 208, or 18.3 percent, were found to have exterior walls which were out of plumb and/or horizontal alignment.
 - (g) 354, or 31.1 percent were found to have deteriorated and/or sagging roofs.
 - (h) 347, or 30.4 percent were found to have exterior siding which was loose, missing, or deteriorated.
 - (i) 287, or 25.3 percent were found to have window frames, sashes, and/or panes which were loose, broken and/or deteriorated or missing.
 - (j) 432, or 38.1 percent, were found to have worn, sagging, and/or deteriorated interior stairs.
 - (k) 345, or 30.4 percent, were found to have exposed electrical wiring.
 - (l) 354, or 31.1 percent were found to have evident or reported vermin infestation.
 - (m) 487, or 42.9 percent were found to have obsolescent plumbing.
 - (n) 240, or 21.1 percent were found to have lacked installed central heat in each dwelling unit.
 - (o) 349, or 30.7 percent were found to have sagging and/or pitched floors.
 - (p) 401, or 35.2 percent, were found to have worn, loose and/or missing flooring.
 - (q) 353, or 31.1 percent, were found to have plaster missing or evidence of leaks on inside walls and/or ceilings.
 - (r) 392, or 34.5 percent, were found to have worn surfaces and holes in inside walls.
 - (s) 427, or 37.6 percent, were found to have evidence of cracks in inside walls and/or ceilings.
9. Approximately 108 buildings, or 61 percent of the total number of 177 principal buildings devoted to uses which were non-residential in character were found, based upon all surveys and inspections, to be buildings with either extensive minor, or major defects, and/or serious deficiencies.
10. Approximately 1,403 buildings, or 53.8 percent of the total number of 2,605 principal buildings within the area devoted to dwelling uses, were found, based upon all surveys and inspections, to be buildings with either extensive minor, or major defects, and/or serious deficiencies.
11. Approximately 3,925 dwelling units, or 44.9 percent of the total number of 8,740 dwelling units within the area, were found

based on all surveys and inspections, to be in principal buildings with either extensive minor, or major defects, and/or serious deficiencies.

12. Approximately 596 dwelling units, or 6.7 percent of the total number of 8,834 dwelling units enumerated for the area by the 1960 U. S. Census of Housing, were reported by the Census to be dilapidated and may, therefore, be considered generally as unfit for human habitation.
13. Approximately 678 dwelling units, or 7.7 percent of the total number of 8,834 dwelling units enumerated for the area by the 1960 U. S. Census of Housing, were reported by the Census to be occupied by an average number of more than 1 person per room, and may, therefore, be considered generally to be overcrowded.
14. Approximately 650 dwelling units, or 7.4 percent of the total number of 8,834 dwelling units enumerated for the area by the 1960 Census of Housing, were reported by the Census to be vacant.
15. The coverage of land area by buildings in the urban renewal area, was found to range from 30-80 percent of net residential area, as compared with the 30 percent maximum coverage recommended by the Committee on the Hygiene of Housing of the American Public Health Association in "Standards for Healthful Housing: Planning the Neighborhood" for areas such as the urban renewal area where two-and three-family dwelling types predominate.
16. The floor area ratio, or the ratio between the total floor area of a building and the ground area covered by the building, for buildings in the urban renewal area, was found to range from 0.95-1.97, as compared with the maximum floor area ratio of 1.0 established by the "Proposed Zoning Regulations" for the City of Boston for areas such as the urban renewal area where two- and three-family dwelling types predominate.
17. The residential building lots in the urban renewal area, on which there are a substantial number of three-family dwelling types, were found to average 4,000 square feet in area, and 40 feet in width, as compared with the minimum lot size dimensions of 8,000 square feet and 50 feet, respectively, for three-family dwellings established by the "Proposed Zoning Regulations" for the City of Boston. A predominant number of residential building lots within the urban renewal area were found not large enough in size

to provide for the street corner sight distances, off-street parking and loading, access drive, and screening requirements established for such building lots by the "Proposed Zoning Regulations" for the City of Boston.

18. The net dwelling unit density within the urban renewal area was found to range from 12-120 dwelling units, and to average 33 dwelling units per net residential acre of land, as compared with the 20 dwelling units per net residential acre or less for such dwelling types recommended by the Committee on the Hygiene of Housing of the American Public Health Association in "Standards for Healthful Housing: Planning the Neighborhood" for areas such as the urban renewal area where two-and three-family dwelling types predominate.
19. A number of large, older, and often obsolete single-family houses within the urban renewal area were found to have been converted to multi-family dwellings and nursing homes incompatible with adjoining dwelling uses in the area.
20. A number of first-floor dwelling units within multi-family buildings located along Warren Street, Washington Street, Harold Street, and Humboldt Avenue, were found to have been converted to stores and other commercial uses incompatible with the use of combined and adjoining dwelling accommodations in these areas.
21. A number of commercial and industrial, in some instances deteriorating, uses of land and buildings were found, particularly along the Warren Street, Washington Street, Harold Street, and Humboldt Avenue frontages, to be haphazardly mixed and intermingled with land and buildings used for dwelling and institutional purposes such as to create adverse influences from non-residential traffic noise, or smoke detrimental to the dwelling and institutional uses.
22. A number of the local east-west residential service streets within the urban renewal area carry traffic which is generated by the heavy "through" traffic volumes and the abutting non-residential uses which characterize the north-south arterials which are located on the perimeter of the project area. A number of the local residential service streets within the urban renewal area, thus congested, are characterized by limited right-of-way widths, narrow pavements, and on-street parking along one or both sides of the pavement, such as to create a hazard to both pedestrian and vehicular circulation.

23. The Howe, Boardman, Williams, and Godwin Elementary Schools, located within the urban renewal area and built in 1868, 1900, 1892, and 1925 respectively, are all non-fireproof structures, the abandonment of which has been recommended in surveys of the Boston City Planning Board and by other school building surveys as recently as 1957. These surveys have pointed out the existing public elementary school plant is insufficient with respect to building location, condition, capacity, classroom and special facilities, and site development to meet the public elementary school requirements of the Washington Park Area.
24. The amount of public playground space within the urban renewal area was found to be 2.6 acres as compared with a need for 19.4 acres of public playground space based upon the National Recreation Association standard of 222 square feet of space for each of the area's 3,800 elementary school children.
25. The trend in real estate prices between 1955 and 1961 has been downward in a large number of blocks within the urban renewal area, particularly in that section of the area north of Townsend Street. In this section, the index of real estate prices dropped by approximately 30 per cent during this period. In that section of the area south of Townsend Street, the index of real estate prices declined by about 20 per cent in blocks bordering on Townsend Street itself, in blocks located in the western part of the urban renewal area near Washington Street, and in blocks running through the center of the area north of Seaver Street, and between Humboldt and Elm Hill Avenues. Available data indicates that the trend of real estate prices elsewhere in the City of Boston during the same period of time was upward.
26. The participation of lending institutions in the real estate market within the urban renewal area, as evidenced in the purchase of home mortgages by savings banks, cooperatives, savings and loan associations, insurance companies, and commercial banks between 1945 and 1961 has been declining. These lending institutions together recorded the acquisition of 250 mortgages during the period 1945-1949, 429 mortgages during the period 1950-1954, 386 mortgages during the period 1955-1959, but only 63 mortgages during the period 1960-1961.
27. The trend in population between 1950 and 1960 has been generally downward within the urban renewal area. The 1950 population of the area was 32,650 persons. By 1960, the population of the area had declined to 25,922 persons, a net loss of 6,728 persons, or 20 per cent.

28. Approximately 28.0 cases of infant mortality for each 1,000 infants under one year of age were found to have occurred within the urban renewal area between 1955 and 1959 as compared with 26.7 such cases for the City of Boston as a whole.
29. Approximately 106.4 new cases of pulmonary tuberculosis for each 100,000 residents were found to have occurred within the urban renewal area in 1958 as compared with 79.5 such cases for the City of Boston as a whole.
30. Approximately 12.2 commitments by the Youth Service Board for each 1,000 residents under 18 years of age were found to have occurred within the urban renewal area between 1958 and 1960 as compared with 3.8 such commitments for the City of Boston as a whole.
31. Approximately 17.2 percent of the total population and 21.5 percent of the households within the urban renewal area were found to have been given public welfare assistance during 1960 as compared with 6.3 and 11.4 percent, respectively, for the City of Boston as a whole.
32. Approximately 25 percent of the in-patient admissions, 35 percent of the out-patient admissions, and 40 percent of the emergency admissions at the City Hospital during 1960 were found to have come from the urban renewal area of Roxbury and its vicinity as compared with the hospital's case loads for areas elsewhere within its service area.

The results of all surveys and studies, with respect to the present character and condition of Clearance Section Tract No. 1 can be set forth as follows:

1. Approximately 24.6 acres of land within the tract were found to be improved with buildings or other structures, and approximately 4.8 acres were found to be devoted to improved streets. Together such improved land was found to represent approximately 82.8 percent of the total of about 35.5 acres of land lying within the perimeter boundaries of Tract No. 1. Land improved with buildings, streets, or other improvements was found to be distributed generally throughout the entire tract.
2. Approximately 27.7 acres of land within the tract were found to be devoted to uses which were residential in character, exclusive of streets, alleys, and other public rights-of-way. Such land was found to represent approximately 90.2 percent of the total

net land area of about 30.7 acres lying within the perimeter boundaries of Tract No. 1. Blocks clearly predominantly residential in character were found to be distributed generally throughout the entire tract.

3. Approximately 3.0 acres of land within the tract were found to be devoted to uses which were non-residential in character, including businesses, industries and institutions. Such land was found to represent approximately 9.8 percent of the total net land area within the tract. Blocks characterized by non-residential uses were found to be distributed generally throughout many sections of the entire tract. Within these blocks non-residential uses were found to be intermingled with and adjoining uses which were residential in character.
4. Approximately 353 buildings, or 98.9 percent of the total number of 357 principal buildings within the tract were found to be non-fireproof or of frame construction.
5. Approximately 41 buildings, or 11.5 percent of the total number of 357 principal buildings within the tract, were found to be devoted to uses which were non-residential in character, including businesses, industries and institutions. Such buildings were found to be distributed generally throughout many sections of the entire tract, intermingled with and adjoining buildings devoted to uses which were residential in character.
6. Approximately 311 buildings, or 87.1 percent of the 357 principal buildings within the tract were found, based on all surveys and inspections, to be buildings with either extensive minor, or major defects, and/or serious deficiencies.
7. Approximately 262 buildings, or 73.4 percent of the 357 principal buildings within the tract were found, based on all surveys and inspections, to be buildings with such major defects and/or serious deficiencies as to be beyond repair to a point warranting clearance.
8. The detailed interior and exterior inspections of 333 or 93.3 percent of the 357 principal buildings in the tract, disclosed that:
 - (a) 356, or 99.7 percent were found to have one or more defects.
 - (b) 326, or 91.3 percent were found to have five or more defects.
 - (c) 253, or 70.9 percent were found to have ten or more defects.

- (d) 144, or 40.3 percent were found to have fifteen or more defects.
- (e) 149, or 41.7 percent were found to have foundation walls which were deteriorated, sinking and/or out of line.
- (f) 101, or 28.3 percent were found to have exterior walls which were out of plumb and/or horizontal alignment.
- (g) 224, or 62.7 percent were found to have sagging or out of line roofs.
- (h) 223, or 62.5 percent were found to have loose, missing, or deteriorated roof material.
- (i) 234, or 65.5 percent were found to have window frames, sashes and/or panes which were loose, broken and/or deteriorated or missing.
- (j) 190, or 53.2 percent were found to have worn, sagging, and/or deteriorated interior stairs.
- (k) 60, or 16.8 percent were found to have exposed electrical wiring.
- (l) 65, or 18.2 percent were found to have evident or reported vermin infestation.
- (m) 61, or 17.1 percent were found to have corroded and/or leaking plumbing.
- (n) 88, or 24.6 percent were found to have lacked installed central heat.
- (o) 173, or 48.5 percent were found to have sagging or pitched floors.
- (p) 205, or 57.4 percent were found to have worn, loose and/or missing flooring.
- (q) 74, or 20.7 percent were found to have evidence of leaks on inside walls and/or ceilings.
- (r) 185, or 51.8 percent were found to have loose and/or broken base material in inside walls and/or ceilings.
- (s) 222, or 62.2 percent were found to have evidence of cracks in inside walls, and/or ceilings.
- (t) 263, or 73.7 percent were found to have exterior stairs and/or railings which were worn, deteriorated and/or broken or missing.
- (u) 248, or 69.5 percent were found to have exterior siding which was loose, missing or deteriorated.
- (v) 263, or 73.7 percent were found to have chimneys which were deteriorated and/or out of alignment.
- (w) 129, or 36.1 percent were found to have loose and/or deteriorated or missing supporting columns and/or piers.
- (x) 122, or 33.6 percent were found to have inoperable and/or deteriorated central heating systems.
- (y) 81, or 22.7 percent were found to have toilet compartments inadequately ventilated.

- (z) 191, or 53.5 percent were found to have broken, deteriorated or missing impervious basement floors.
 - (aa) 138, or 38.7 percent were found to contain an accumulation of combustible debris creating a fire hazard.
 - (bb) 79, or 22.1 percent were found to have dampness or water in the basement.
- 9. Approximately 20 buildings or 48.8 percent of the total number of 41 principal buildings devoted to uses which were non-residential in character were found, based on all surveys and inspections to be buildings with either extensive minor, or major defects, and/or serious deficiencies.
 - 10. Approximately 291 buildings or 92.7 percent of the total number of 314 principal buildings devoted to dwelling uses, were found, based on all surveys and inspections, to be buildings with either extensive minor, or major defects, and/or serious deficiencies.
 - 11. Approximately 716 dwelling units or 98.5 percent of the total number of 727 dwelling units within the tract, were found, based upon all surveys and inspections, to be in principal buildings with either extensive minor, or major defects, and/or serious deficiencies.

The results of all surveys and studies, with respect to the present character and condition of Clearance Section Tract No. 2 as a whole, can be set forth as follows:

- 1. Approximately 1.9 acres of land within the tract were found to be improved with buildings or other structures, and approximately .2 acres were found to be devoted to improved streets. Together such improved land was found to represent approximately 56.7 percent of the total of about 3.7 acres of land lying within the perimeter boundaries of the Tract No. 2.
- 2. Approximately 3.4 acres of land within the tract were found to be devoted to uses which were residential in character, exclusive of streets, alleys, and other public rights-of-way. Such land was found to represent approximately 97.1 percent of the total net land area of about 3.5 acres lying within the perimeter boundaries of Tract No. 2.
- 3. Approximately .1 acres of land within the tract were found to be devoted to uses which were non-residential in character, including businesses, and institutions. Such land

was found to represent approximately 2.9 percent of the total net land area within the tract.

4. Approximately 18 buildings, or 100 percent of the total number of 18 principal buildings within the tract, were found to be non-fireproof or of frame construction.
5. Approximately 2 buildings, or 11.1 percent of the total number of 18 principal buildings within the tract, were found to be devoted to uses which were non-residential in character, including business and institutional use. Such buildings were found to be intermingled with and adjoining buildings devoted to uses which were residential in character.
6. Approximately 12 buildings, or 66.6 percent of the 18 principal buildings within the tract were found, based on all surveys and inspections, to be buildings with either extensive minor or major defects, and/or serious deficiencies.
7. Approximately 11 buildings, or 61.1 percent of the 18 principal buildings within the tract were found, based on all surveys and inspections, to be buildings with such major defects and/or serious deficiencies as to be beyond repair to a point warranting clearance.
8. The detailed interior and exterior inspections of 17 or 94.5 percent of the 18 principal buildings in the tract, disclosed that:
 - (a) 18, or 100 percent were found to have one or more defects.
 - (b) 18, or 100 percent were found to have five or more defects.
 - (c) 15, or 83.3 percent were found to have ten or more defects.
 - (d) 13, or 72.2 percent were found to have fifteen or more defects.
 - (e) 9, or 50 percent were found to have foundation walls which were deteriorated, sinking and/or out of line.
 - (f) 9, or 50 percent were found to have exterior walls which were out of plumb and/or horizontal alignment.
 - (g) 16, or 88.8 percent were found to have sagging or out of line roofs.
 - (h) 16, or 88.8 percent were found to have loose, missing or deteriorated roof material.
 - (i) 18, or 100 percent were found to have window frames, sashes and/or panes which were loose, broken and/or deteriorated or missing.
 - (j) 11, or 61.1 percent were found to have worn, sagging and/or deteriorated interior stairs.
 - (k) 3, or 16.6 percent were found to have exposed electrical wiring.
 - (l) 3, or 16.6 percent were found to have inoperable electrical fixtures.

- (m) 4, or 22.2 percent were found to have corroded and/or leaking plumbing.
 - (n) 5, or 27.7 percent were found to have lacked installed central heat.
 - (o) 12, or 66.6 percent were found to have sagging or pitched floors.
 - (p) 13, or 72.2 percent were found to have worn, loose, and/or missing flooring.
 - (q) 7, or 38.8 percent were found to have inoperable and/or deteriorated central heating systems.
 - (r) 13, or 72.2 percent were found to have loose and/or broken base material in inside walls and/or ceilings.
 - (s) 14, or 77.7 percent were found to have evidence of cracks in inside walls and/or ceilings.
 - (t) 18, or 100 percent were found to have exterior stairs and/or railings which were worn, deteriorated and/or broken and missing.
 - (u) 16, or 88.8 percent were found to have exterior siding which was loose, missing or deteriorated.
 - (v) 16, or 88.8 percent were found to have chimneys which were deteriorated and/or out of alignment.
 - (w) 13, or 72.2 percent were found to have loose, and/or deteriorated or missing supporting columns and/or piers.
 - (x) 12, or 66.6 percent were found to have toilet compartments inadequately ventilated.
 - (y) 16, or 88.8 percent were found to have broken, deteriorated or missing impervious basement floors.
 - (z) 10, or 55.5 percent were found to contain an accumulation of combustible debris creating a fire hazard.
 - (aa) 6, or 33.3 percent were found to have dampness or water in the basement.
9. Approximately 1 building or 50 percent of the total number of 2 principal buildings devoted to uses which were non-residential in character were found, based on all surveys and inspections, to be buildings with either extensive minor, or major defects, and/or serious deficiencies.
10. Approximately 11 buildings or 68.7 percent of the total number of 16 principal buildings devoted to dwelling uses, were found, based on all surveys and inspections, to be buildings with either extensive minor, or major defects, and/or serious deficiencies.
11. Approximately 23 dwelling units or 58.9 percent of the total number of 39 dwelling units within the tract, were found, based upon all surveys and inspections, to be in principal buildings with either extensive minor, or major defects, and/or serious deficiencies.

The results of all surveys and studies, with respect to the present character and condition of Clearance Section Tract No. 3 as a whole, can be set forth as follows:

1. Approximately 3.3 acres of land within the tract were found to be improved with buildings or other structures, and approximately .7 acres were found to be devoted to improved streets. Together such improved land was found to represent approximately 80 percent of the total of about 5.0 acres of land lying within the perimeter boundaries of Tract No. 3. Land improved with buildings, streets, or other improvements was found to be distributed generally throughout the entire tract.
2. Approximately 2.9 acres of land within the tract were found to be devoted to uses which were residential in character, exclusive of streets, alleys, and other public rights-of-way. Such land was found to represent approximately 67.4 percent of the total net land area of about 4.3 acres lying within the perimeter boundaries of Tract No. 3.
3. Approximately 1.4 acres of land within the tract were found to be devoted to business uses and were non-residential in character. Such land was found to represent approximately 32.6 percent of the total net land area within the tract. Within these blocks non-residential uses were found to be intermingled with and adjoining uses which were residential in character.
4. Approximately 29 buildings, or 100 percent of the total number of 29 principal buildings within the tract, were found to be non-fireproof or of frame construction.
5. Approximately 6 buildings, or 17.2 percent of the total number of 29 principal buildings within the tract, were found to be devoted to business uses and were non-residential in character. Such buildings were found to be distributed generally throughout the entire tract, intermingled with and adjoining buildings devoted to uses which were residential in character.
6. Approximately 24 buildings, or 82.7 percent of the 29 principal buildings within the tract were found, based on all surveys and inspections, to be buildings with either extensive minor, or major defects, and/or serious deficiencies.
7. Approximately 22 buildings or 75.9 percent of the 29 principal buildings within the tract were found, based on all surveys and inspections, to be buildings with such major defects and/or serious deficiencies as to be beyond repair to a point warranting clearance.

8. The detailed interior and exterior inspections of 29 or 100 percent of the principal buildings in the tract, disclosed that:
- (a) 27, or 93.1 percent were found to have one or more defects.
 - (b) 26, or 89.7 percent were found to have five or more defects.
 - (c) 19, or 65.5 percent were found to have ten or more defects.
 - (d) 10, or 34.5 percent were found to have fifteen or more defects.
 - (e) 4, or 13.8 percent were found to have foundation walls which were deteriorated, sinking and/or out of line.
 - (f) 21, or 72.4 percent were found to have loose, missing or deteriorated roof material.
 - (g) 19, or 65.5 percent were found to have sagging or out of line roofs.
 - (h) 13, or 44.8 percent were found to have exterior siding which was loose, missing or deteriorated.
 - (i) 8, or 27.6 percent were found to have window frames, sashes and/or panes which were loose, broken and/or deteriorated or missing.
 - (j) 18, or 62.1 percent were found to have exterior stairs and/or railings which were worn, deteriorated and/or broken or missing.
 - (k) 22, or 75.9 percent were found to have chimneys which were deteriorated and/or out of alignment.
 - (l) 8, or 27.6 percent were found to have loose, and/or deteriorated or missing supporting columns and/or piers.
 - (m) 7, or 24.1 percent were found to contain an accumulation of combustible debris creating a fire hazard.
 - (n) 4, or 13.8 percent were found to have lacked installed central heat.
 - (o) 11, or 37.9 percent were found to have sagging or pitched floors.
 - (p) 17, or 58.6 percent were found to have worn, loose and/or missing flooring.
 - (q) 17, or 58.6 percent were found to have loose and/or broken base material in inside walls and/or ceilings.
 - (r) 14, or 48.3 percent were found to have broken, deteriorated or missing impervious basement floors.
 - (s) 23, or 79.3 percent were found to have evidence of cracks in inside walls and/or ceilings.
 - (t) 18, or 62.1 percent were found to have worn,,sagging, and/or deteriorated interior stairs.
 - (u) 16, or 55.2 percent were found to have inoperable and/or deteriorated central heating systems.

9. Approximately 2 buildings or 33.3 percent of the total number of 6 principal buildings devoted to uses which were non-residential in character were found, based on all surveys and inspections, to be buildings with either extensive minor, or major defects, and/or serious deficiencies.
10. Approximately 22 buildings or 91.7 percent of the total number of 24 principal buildings devoted to dwelling uses were found, based on all surveys and inspections, to be buildings with either extensive minor, or major defects and/or serious deficiencies.
11. Approximately 62 dwelling units or 91.2 percent of the total number of 68 dwelling units within the tract, were found, based upon all surveys and inspections, to be in principal buildings with either extensive minor, or major defects, and/or serious deficiencies.

Since Clearance Section Tracts No. 1, 2, and 3 are integral parts of the larger Washington Park Urban Renewal Area within which they are situated, it is reasonable to assume that the environmental deficiencies and the economic and social characteristics of the urban renewal area as a whole, previously set forth, are reflected therein.

APPLICATION FOR TEMPORARY LOAN
EARLY LAND ACQUISITION
PROJECT NO. MASS. R-24

BINDER NO.

Washington Park Urban Renewal Area
Boston Redevelopment Authority
Boston . Massachusetts

SUBMISSION DATE

EXHIBIT A : PERIMETER BOUNDARIES OF PROJECT AREA

That certain tract of land, referred to as the Washington Park Urban Renewal Area, situated in the City of Boston, County of Suffolk, and Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and bounded generally as follows:

Beginning at the southeasterly corner of the tract herein described, at a point which is the intersection of the easterly sideline of Blue Hill Avenue with the southerly sideline of Seaver Street;

Thence running in a westerly and northwesterly direction across Blue Hill Avenue and along the southerly sideline of Seaver Street to a point which is the intersection of said line with the easterly sideline of Walnut Avenue;

Thence running in a northwesterly direction across Walnut Avenue to a point which is the intersection of the westerly sideline of Walnut Avenue with the southerly sideline of Columbus Avenue;

Thence running in a northwesterly direction along the southerly sideline of Columbus Avenue to a point which is the intersection of said sideline with the easterly sideline of Washington Street;

Thence turning and running in a westerly direction across Washington Street to a point which is the intersection of the westerly sideline of Washington Street with the southerly sideline of Atherton Street;

Thence turning and running in a northeasterly direction along the westerly sideline of Washington Street to a point which is the intersection of said sideline with the southerly sideline of Dudley Street;

Thence turning and running in a northerly direction across Dudley Street to a point which is the intersection of the northerly sideline of Dudley Street with the westerly sideline of Guild Row;

Thence turning and running in an easterly direction across Guild Row to a point which is the intersection of the easterly sideline of Guild Row with the northerly sideline of Dudley Street;

Thence running in an easterly direction along the northerly sideline of Dudley Street to a point which is the intersection of said line with the westerly sideline of Warren Street;

Thence running in an easterly direction across Warren Street to a point which is the intersection of the easterly sideline of Warren Street with the northerly sideline of Dudley Street;

Thence turning and running in a southerly direction across Dudley Street to a point which is the intersection of the southerly sideline of Dudley Street with the easterly sideline of Warren Street;

Thence running in a southeasterly and southerly direction along the easterly sideline of Warren Street to a point which is the intersection of said line with the westerly sideline of Blue Hill Avenue;

Thence running in a southerly direction across Blue Hill Avenue to a point which is the intersection of the easterly sideline of Blue Hill Avenue with the northerly sideline of Geneva Avenue;

Thence turning and running in a southwesterly and southerly direction along the easterly sideline of Blue Hill Avenue to a point which is the intersection of said line with the northerly sideline of Seaver Street;

Thence running in a southerly direction across Seaver Street to a point which is the intersection of the easterly sideline of Blue Hill Avenue with the southerly sideline of Seaver Street, which is the point and place of beginning.

APPLICATION FOR TEMPORARY LOAN
EARLY LAND ACQUISITION
PROJECT NO. MASS. R-24

BINDER NUMBER

Washington Park Urban Renewal Area
Boston Redevelopment Authority
Boston . Massachusetts

SUBMISSION DATE

EXHIBIT B : PERIMETER BOUNDARIES OF CLEARANCE SECTION TRACTS

CLEARANCE SECTION TRACT NO. 1

That certain tract of land, referred to as Clearance Section Tract No. 1, situated in the Washington Park Urban Renewal Area, City of Boston, County of Suffolk, and Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and bounded generally as follows:

Beginning at a point which is the intersection of the westerly sideline of Warren Street and the northerly sideline of Munroe Street;

Thence running westerly along the northerly sideline of Munroe Street to a point which is the intersection of the northerly sideline of Munroe Street and the easterly sideline of Humboldt Avenue;

Thence turning and running northerly along the easterly sideline of Humboldt Avenue to a point which is the intersection of the northerly sideline of Bower Street and the easterly sideline of Humboldt Avenue;

Thence turning and running northeasterly along the easterly sideline of Laurel Street to a point which is the intersection of the property line which divides the rear of those properties abutting on Catawba Street and Ottawa Street;

Thence turning and running easterly along a line which divides those properties as abut Catawba Street and Ottawa Street and the northerly sideline of property located at 45 Sherman Street now or formerly owned by Lena Rogan to an intersection with the easterly sideline of Sherman Street;

Thence across Sherman Street to a point which is the intersection of the easterly sideline of Sherman Street and the northwesterly corner of 46 Sherman Street now or formerly owned by Ida L. Gills;

Thence turning and running northerly along the easterly sideline of Sherman Street to a point which is the intersection of the easterly sideline of Sherman Street and the northerly side of Rockland Street 200 feet westerly from Warren Street located on the southerly sideline of #3 Rockland Street now or formerly owned by Lawrence L. Green;

Thence turning and running northwesterly along the northerly sideline of Rockland Street to a point which is the intersection of the northerly sideline of Rockland Street and the easterly sideline of Walnut Street;

Thence turning and running northeasterly along the easterly sideline of Walnut Street to a point which is the intersection of the easterly sideline of Walnut Street, and a point 130 feet beyond the northerly sideline of St. Richard Street on the westerly sideline of property now or formerly owned by Charles M. Blake et al exctrs;

Thence turning and running easterly along a line which divides those properties as abut Catawba Street and Ottawa Street and the northerly sideline of property located at 45 Sherman Street now or formerly owned by Lena Rogan to an intersection with the easterly sideline of Sherman Street;

Thence across Sherman Street to a point which is the intersection of the easterly sideline of Sherman Street and the northwesterly corner of 46 Sherman Street now or formerly owned by Ida L. Gills;

Thence turning and running northerly along the easterly sideline of Sherman Street to a point which is the intersection of the easterly sideline of Sherman Street and the northerly side of Rockland Street 200 feet westerly from Warren Street located on the southerly sideline of #3 Rockland Street now or formerly owned by Lawrence L. Green;

Thence turning and running northwesterly along the northerly sideline of Rockland Street to a point which is the intersection of the northerly sideline of Rockland Street and the easterly sideline of Walnut Street;

Thence turning and running northeasterly along the easterly sideline of Walnut Street to a point which is the intersection of the easterly sideline of Walnut Street, and a point 130 feet beyond the northerly sideline of St. Richard Street on the westerly sideline of property now or formerly owned by Charles M. Blake et al exctrs;

Thence turning and running northwesterly across Walnut Street to a point on the northerly sideline of Circuit Street on the property now or formerly owned by Mary J. O'Hea 30 feet from the westerly sideline of Mt. Warren Street;

Thence turning and running southwesterly along the northerly sideline of Circuit Street to a point which is the intersection of the northerly sideline of Circuit Street and the easterly sideline of Fountain Street.

Thence turning and running northerly along the easterly sideline of Fountain Street to a point which is the intersection of the easterly sideline of Fountain Street and the southerly sideline of #6 Fountain Street on property now or formerly owned by Robert H. and Ernestine Walker;

Thence turning and running easterly along the southerly sideline of #6 Fountain Street to a point which is the intersection of the southerly sideline of #6 Fountain Street and the easterly sideline of #6 Fountain Street on the property now or formerly owned by Robert H. and Ernestine Walker;

Thence turning and running northerly along the easterly sideline of #6 Fountain Street to a point which is the intersection of the easterly sideline of #6 Fountain Street and the southerly sideline of #5 Dabney Place on property now or formerly owned by Rhoda Gambit;

Thence turning and running northwesterly across Walnut Street to a point on the northerly sideline of Circuit Street on the property now or formerly owned by Mary J. O'Hea 30 feet from the westerly sideline of Mt. Warren Street;

Thence turning and running southwesterly along the northerly sideline of Circuit Street to a point which is the intersection of the northerly sideline of Circuit Street and the easterly sideline of Fountain Street.

Thence turning and running northerly along the easterly sideline of Fountain Street to a point which is the intersection of the easterly sideline of Fountain Street and the southerly sideline of #6 Fountain Street on property now or formerly owned by Robert H. and Ernestine Walker;

Thence turning and running easterly along the southerly sideline of #6 Fountain Street to a point which is the intersection of the southerly sideline of #6 Fountain Street and the easterly sideline of #6 Fountain Street on the property now or formerly owned by Robert H. and Ernestine Walker;

Thence turning and running northerly along the easterly sideline of #6 Fountain Street to a point which is the intersection of the easterly sideline of #6 Fountain Street and the southerly sideline of #5 Dabney Place on property now or formerly owned by Rhoda Gambit;

Thence turning and running northeasterly along the southeasterly sideline of #5 Dabney Place on property now or formerly owned by Rhoda Gambit, across the southeasterly end of Dabney Place and along the southeasterly sideline of #3 Dabney Place on property now or formerly owned by Richard S. Folger to a point which is the intersection of the northeasterly sideline of #3 Dabney Place and the southwesterly sideline of #9 Tolman Place on property now or formerly owned by Gladys W. Bouwer;

Thence turning and running northwesterly along the southwesterly sideline of #9 Tolman Place to a point which is the intersection of said sideline and the southeasterly rearline of #30 Regent Street on property now or formerly owned by John Dearborn;

Thence turning and running northeasterly along the northwesterly sideline of #9 Tolman Place to a point which is the intersection of said sideline and the southwesterly sideline of #26 Regent Street on property now or formerly owned by George and Anne Garland;

Thence turning and running southeasterly along the southwesterly sideline of #26 Regent Street to a point which is the intersection of said sideline and the westerly sideline of #5 Tolman Place on property now or formerly owned by Glover Realty Corp. (Mass. Corp.);

Thence turning and running northwesterly along the westerly sideline of #5 Tolman Place and #2 - 3 Hansford Place on property now or formerly owned by Iline W. Daly, to a point which is the intersection of said property line and the northeasterly sideline of #26 Regent Street;

Thence turning and running easterly along the northerly sideline of those properties abutting Hansford Place to a point which is the intersection of easterly end of said sideline and the westerly sideline of Warren Street;

Thence turning and running southeasterly along the westerly sideline of Warren Street to the point and place of beginning.

CLEARANCE SECTION TRACT NO. 2

That certain tract of land, referred to as Clearance Section Tract No. 2, situated in the Washington Park Urban Renewal Area, City of Boston, County of Suffolk, and Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and bounded generally as follows:

Beginning at the southeasterly corner, at a point which is the intersection of the northerly sideline of Townsend Street and the westerly sideline of Humboldt Avenue;

Thence running westerly along the northerly sideline of Townsend Street to a point of intersection with the easterly' sideline of a right of way situated in the rear of properties abutting on the easterly sideline of Harold Street;

Thence running northerly along the easterly sideline of said right of way to a point of intersection with southwesterly corner of 88 Munroe Street, property now or formerly owned by Anderson C. and Annie O. Porter, and abutting the southerly sideline of Munroe Street;

Thence running easterly along a line designated as the rear property line on the southerly sideline of properties abutting on the southerly sideline of Munroe Street, and the southerly sideline of 75 Humboldt Avenue, property now or formerly owned by Margaret R. Gatewood, to a point of intersection with the Westerly sideline of Humboldt Avenue and the southerly sideline of a property abutting the westerly sideline of Humboldt Avenue;

Thence running southerly along the westerly sideline of Humboldt Avenue to the point and place of beginning.

CLEARANCE SECTION TRACT NO. 3

That certain tract of land, referred to as Clearance Section Tract No. 3, situated in the Washington Park Renewal Area, City of Boston, County of Suffolk, and Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and bounded generally as follows:

Beginning at a point which is the intersection of the westerly sideline of Humboldt Avenue and the northerly sideline of Waumbeck Street;

Thence running northwesterly along the northerly sideline of Waumbeck Street and the westerly sideline of #77 Waumbeck Street, now or formerly owned by Edward M. Jr. and Barbara Couzens;

Thence turning and running northeasterly along the westerly sideline of 77 Waumbeck Street to a point which is the intersection of the westerly sideline of #77 Waumbeck Street and the southerly sideline of #24 Hollander Street now or formerly owned by Max Kaitz;

Thence turning and running easterly to a point which intersects with the southwesterly sideline of #22 Hollander Street, now or formerly owned by Rafe D. Kelley;

Thence turning and running northeasterly along the westerly sideline of property at #22 Hollander Street to a point which intersects with the southerly sideline of Hollander Street;

Thence crossing Hollander Street along an extension of the easterly sideline of #24 Hollander Street, now or formerly owned by Max Kaitz, to a point which is the intersection of said extension and the northerly sideline of Hollander Street;

Thence turning and running easterly along the northerly sideline of Hollander Street to a point which is the intersection of the northerly sideline of Hollander Street and the easterly sideline of #25 Hollander Street at property now or formerly owned by James E. and Lillian M. McCrea;

Thence turning and running northeasterly along the easterly sideline of #25 Hollander Street to a point which is the intersection of said sideline and the rear property' line as it divides those properties abutting Hollander Street and Holworthy Street;

Thence turning and running westerly along said property dividing line to a point which is the intersection of said rear property line and the easterly sideline of #54 Holworthy Street, property now or formerly owned by Brookline Realty Investment Corporation;

Thence turning and running northeasterly along the easterly sideline of #24 Holworthy Street to a point which is the intersection of said sideline and the southerly sideline of Holworthy Street;

Thence crossing Holworthy Street along an extension of the easterly sideline of #24 Holworthy Street to a point which is the intersection of said extension and the southerly sideline of #35 Holworthy Street, property now or formerly owned by Abraham D. Potter;

Thence turning and running southeasterly along the northerly sideline of Holworthy Street to a point which intersects with the easterly sideline of #35 Holworthy Street;

Thence turning and running northeasterly along the easterly sideline of #35 Holworthy Street to a point which intersects with the rear lot line dividing those properties abutting on Harrishof Street and Holworthy Streets;

Thence turning and running southeasterly along said rear dividing line to a point which intersects with the easterly sideline of #86 Harrishof Street, property now or formerly owned by William and Lillian C. Warren;

Thence turning and running northeasterly along the easterly sideline of #86 Harrishof Street to a point which intersects with the southerly side of Harrishof Street;

Thence turning and running southeasterly along the southerly sideline of Harrishof Street to a point which intersects with the westerly sideline of Humboldt Avenue;

Thence turning and running southwesterly along the westerly sideline of Humboldt Avenue to the point and place of beginning.